

**REMARKS**

This amendment is accompanied by a letter to the Draftsperson submitting formal drawings.

Claims 1-9, 13 and 15-18 remain in the application, of which claims 1 and 15 are the independent claims.

Claims 1 and 15 have been substantially narrowed. These claims are specifically focused on a novel and non-obvious aspect of applicants' invention. That aspect of the invention is the capability of a user of a mobile device to a) receive a typewritten message over a wireless connection, the message being displayed a touch screen of the mobile device, b) create a handwritten reply, and c) transmit the handwritten reply to, for example, the sending party along with the original typewritten reply in the same message field. (The reply message could, of course, be directed to some third party if desired.) As recited in claim 15, the reply is sent such that the handwritten message is displayed in handwritten form and the typewritten message is displayed in typewritten form.

In short, applicants have recognized the desirability and convenience of a user being able to mix one text representation form with another in the course of sending a reply that includes the original message. That is, applicants were the first to recognize the desirability of a user being able to a) receive a typewritten message, b) formulate a handwritten reply, and c) include them together in a reply message in the same message field.

This aspect of the invention is described, for example, at page 14, lines 6-14 and is shown in FIG. 2 at boxes 211 and 212. An example of the combined typewritten/handwritten message field is shown in FIG. 8.

Neither the cited Blakeslee et al ("Blakeslee") nor Cobbley et al ("Cobbley") references, considered singly or in combination, show or suggest this unique feature. Nor do these references, considered singly or in combination, anticipate applicants' claims.

Blakeslee, in particular, shows the transmission of handwritten messages over

a wireless connection. However, contrary to applicants claims 1 and 15, applicants find no teaching in Blakeslee of the transmission of a typewritten message received over the wireless connection. It may be noted, in particular, that the typewritten message "Call from Bob Hunter" in FIG. 2, for example, would appear to be a message locally generated by device 10 in response to receipt of an incoming call. Contrary to applicants' claims, then, that message in Blakeslee is neither received over the wireless connection nor is it a message composed by a second user.

Even more so, then, applicants find no teaching in Blakeslee that a typewritten message is included in an handwritten reply message. Indeed, it does not appear that the original message in Blakeslee is included in any reply, no matter what form the original message may have been in. Certainly, moreover, there is no teaching in Blakeslee that the transmitted message is such that "said handwritten message is displayed in handwritten form and said typewritten message is displayed in typewritten form" as claim 15 now recites

Cobbley discloses a system in which handwritten text input from a user is transmitted over a wireless connection to a server that a) performs handwriting recognition to convert the handwritten text into typewritten text, and b) transmits the typewritten text back to the user, who may be continuing with handwritten input. Thus as seen in FIG. 1 of Cobbley, the user has already handwritten text 21 and that text has already been returned to the user in typewritten form, while the user continues to handwrite text 23 which will also be transmitted to the server for conversion into typewritten text.

Certainly the picture presented in Cobbley bears some resemblance to, for example, applicants' FIG. 8 in that in both, a combination of typewritten text and handwriting can be seen. However, Cobbley is not a messaging system wherein one party sends a message to another, who replies. Rather, the typewritten text received by the Cobbley user is text that the user himself/herself had composed. This is contrary to the requirement of applicants' claims that the received typewritten message "was composed by a second user."

Moreover, applicants find nothing in Cobbley indicating that when the

handwritten text 23 is transmitted, the previously received typewritten text 21 is transmitted along with it. At best, when the user desires to correct an error in the typewritten text that was received, a correction message, and not the previously received typewritten text itself, is transmitted (col. 7, lines 15-18; FIG. 4A at 102). Thus Cobbley cannot be said to anticipate the requirement of applicants' claims that the handwritten message image is transmitted "together with said typewritten received message."

It is respectfully submitted that no obvious combination of Blakeslee with Cobbley would anticipate applicants' claims either. Since Cobbley is directed to a system that translates handwriting into typewritten text, it would arguably be obvious to use Cobbley in a system such as Blakeslee's so that the party receiving the message in Blakeslee would receive clean typewritten text rather than handwriting. However, applicants see no way that would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine these references in a way that teaches applicants handwriting-with-typewritten-text feature or anticipates the recitations of applicants' claims.

Applicants point out to the examiner the well-known fact that prior to applicants' invention many email systems allowed a user to reply to a typewritten email message by sending a reply typewritten message that included the original message. It remained for applicants to recognize the desirability of allowing a user who receives a typewritten message to send a reply message that a) includes the received typewritten message, b) but with the reply not also being typewritten but, rather, handwritten.

Claims 2-9 and 13 depend from claim 1 and claims 16-18 depend from claim 15. Those claims are submitted to be allowable at least for the reasons set forth hereinabove relative to claims 1 and 15.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all of the claims in the application in are condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage of the application to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Henry Fuoss et al.

By: 

Ronald D. Slusky  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 26,585  
(732) 249-0900

Law Office of Ronald D. Slusky  
P.O. Box 4378  
Highland Park, New Jersey 08904-4378  
Date: 10/08/2003